

REMARKS

Rejection of claims 1, 3, 5-14, 16-23, 31-37, and 40-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,475,826 (Fischer)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1, 3, 5-14, 16-23, 31-37, and 40-43. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Fischer does not disclose or suggest all of the limitations of amended claims 1 or 23. Specifically, for claim 1, Fischer does not disclose calculating a revised hash value for said revised set of N information blocks; while calculating a check hash value for said N information blocks by performing a hash operation on said N information blocks; then comparing said check hash value with said initial hash value; and accepting said revised hash value for said revised set of N information blocks if said check hash value matches said initial hash value. For claim 23, Fischer does not disclose calculating a second hash key for said revised block of data, wherein said revised block of data immediately prior to being revised corresponds to a first hash key and wherein said first hash key is one of said hash keys for said plurality of blocks of data; utilizing said stored hash keys, including said first hash key, to calculate a check root key while utilizing said stored hash keys and said second hash key substituted in place of said first hash key to calculate a new root key; comparing said check root key with said initial root key; accepting said new root key if said check root key matches said initial root key. Fischer does not disclose to compare a calculated hash of the original block data with a stored hash of the original block data, and then to accept a revised hash based on the comparison.

Fischer discloses a method for protecting a file using a single hash. Abs. When a file is to be altered, Fischer discloses to generate a “scratch data” file which “contains record processing information” of the file, which may be used to restore the file if the operation of updating the file is interrupted. Fischer, col. 6, lns. 27-50, quoting lns. 32-33. The scratch data file contains four fields, elements 52-58, related toward processing information and one field 60 which is a hash of the four fields. Fischer, Fig. 3, elements 52-60; col. 6, ln. 60 through col. 7, ln. 14. During a file alteration process, Fig. 4, Fischer discloses to open a scratch file associated with the original file, compute a hash “of fields 52, 54, 56 and 58” (see, Fig. 3) which are contained in the scratch data, and to compare the computed hash to a previous scratch data hash. Fischer, Fig. 4, elements 1025, 1030, 1050, col. 9, lns. 23-42, quoting lns. 30-31. Fischer does

not disclose to compare a computed hash of the original block data with a stored hash of the original block data, and then to accept a revised hash based on the comparison.

Dependent claims 3, 5-14, 16-22, 31-37, and 40-43 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 23. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of dependent claims 3, 5-14, 16-22, 31-37, and 40-43 and requests the withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claims 2, 4, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US 5,475,826 (Fischer)

Applicant submits that dependent claims 2, 4, and 24 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 23, which are deemed to be allowable in view of reason described above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of dependent claims 2, 4, and 24 and requests the withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claims 15, 28-30, and 38-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US 5,475,826 (Fischer) and further in view of US 5,754,659 (Sprunk)

Applicant submits that dependent claims 15, 28-30, and 38-39 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 23, which are deemed to be allowable in view of reason described above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of dependent claims 15, 28-30, and 38-39 and requests the withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Date: June 23, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Larry T. Cullen/

Larry T. Cullen

Reg. No.: 44,489

Motorola Connected Home Solutions

101 Tournament Drive

Horsham, PA 19044

(215) 323-1797